



LUCERNE VALLEY
PHASE II COMMUNITY PLAN MEETING
JUNE 20th, 2005
MEETING NOTES

These meeting notes are not a transcript or verbatim record of the dialogue that occurred at the community meeting. These notes are intended to capture, to the best of our ability, a summary of the discussion that occurred during the Open Discussion portion of the meeting, including comments and questions from the public and responses from County staff (and their representatives) that were provided during the meeting. These notes also include additional information researched after the meeting in an effort to fully address the questions.

Public Question: How was the committee formed?

County Response: It was established using LVEDA as the starting point since they were already an established and active group within the community.

Public Question: The committee should be subject to the Brown Act (public meetings act).

County Response: The Brown Act applies to elected officials and committees appointed by elected officials. For example, the Planning Commission and the Municipal Advisory Committee (MAC). (Source: Calif. Government Code Sections 54950-54954.) The committee is a group of volunteers and members were not appointed, so it is not subject to the Brown Act.

Public Comment: The population growth seems unrealistic.

County Response: Our opinion is that it does reflect an accurate growth rate. Increased growth is a recent trend. The long-term trend we base our projections on has been a slower rate of growth.

Public Comment: The plan does not reflect the community's opinion. It does not represent the opinions of everyone. It represents the consultants' opinions.

County Response: There are several opportunities to provide public input. We encourage everyone in the community to come to the meetings and to continue to provide their feedback either at the meetings or through written comments. Where there are conflicting opinions we will do our best to determine the most widely-held view.

Public Comment: Don't you need to respond to our comments/questions and what we want. It is unlawful or illegal not to respond. We expect a response within 10 days to all of our questions and comments.

County Response: I don't know that we can get responses to you within 10 days but we will certainly try to get you responses to your questions.

Public Question: What is the code number for the law regulating this process?

County Response: California Government Code Sections 65350-65362 regulates the preparation of General Plans, of which this community plan is a part.

Public Comment: Issuing 7-9 will-serve letters per week provides evidence of growth within the community. The water supply, sheriff, fire chief, and public safety services do not seem to be adequate to serve the growing population. The current services are not even adequate for the existing population. The plan needs more emphasis on safety services.

County Response: Specific details such as staffing requirements will not be presented in this document, since it is a policy document. However, policies that have been included in the document state that new development will be required to provide or contribute to the appropriate level of services to support it.

Public Comment: The abandoned golf course should be developed first.

County Response: Rancho Lucerne is a permitted development that includes a golf course as part of the project description and requirements.

Public Question: a) The plan is too general, who is going to interpret this?
b) We should look at self governance through a CSD. We don't have local control, I question if this is a democratic process.
c) The land should not be rezoned without notice.

County Response: a) The County will interpret the plan and use it to evaluate proposed development projects. It will be implemented by the

County Development Code. The public should stay involved with the process in order to continue to provide their input .

b) Formation of a CSD (Community Services District) is outlined in California Government Code Sections 61100 – 61107. Contact the Local Agency Formation Commission at 909-387-5866 or www.sblafco.org

c) Public notice is published prior to any zone changes.

Public Comment: It is difficult to make it to the County offices.

County Response: We understand that it is difficult; however, there are multiple ways that you can contact the County to get information and to provide input. The County can be contacted by phone, mail, e-mail and they also have a website. (www.sbcounty.gov)

Public Question: What is currently being done with regard to modular homes and subdivisions?

County Response: Modular and manufactured homes are allowed through the building permit process.

Public Comment: My land is currently residential; however the plan shows that it will be rezoned to industrial and I am not in agreement with this.

Public Comment: We need to fight to keep this area rural. Water is a major issue, look at Big Bear they did not get involved early on and now they will have to depend on recycled water to supplement their water supply. The Field Representative should be here.

Public Comment: If the community industrial area gets expanded, the uses that could locate in the area will have potential negative impacts (health, noise, etc.) on the schools and adjacent residential areas. They should be moved or the area should not be rezoned.

County Response: As any new development is proposed, its potential effects on the environment are evaluated in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Mitigation measures and project requirements will be applied as appropriate to maintain or improve environmental conditions. The CEQA statute is found in California Public Resources Code, Division 13, and the CEQA regulations are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

Public Comment: The community should be left the way it is. The committee who provided input on this plan has a different perspective and interest than the majority of residents.

- Public Comment: I was not properly noticed for this meeting.
- County Comment: We encourage all of you to sign in order to receive future information relative to the Community Plan.
- Public Comment: What is going to be done about left hand turn lanes on SR-18? We need a left hand turn lane (on SR-18) at Custer. It is a safety issue. Left hand turn lanes throughout the community would provide improved safety.
- County Response: Caltrans is in charge of planning and funding improvements to SR-18. The County has met and will continue to meet with Caltrans and discuss the improvements requested by the community.
- Public Comment: A few comments/questions:
- The population figures are unrealistic, particularly with all the growth in the region.
 - What contribution would the additional industrial areas make to the community?
 - How do you justify the need for the additional industrial when nearby George Air Force base is underutilized?
 - A ½ mile corridor of industrial on the ridge will be highly visible and undesirable. It would not complement the rural character that is valued by residents.
- County Response: The proposed IC Community Industrial district could provide jobs and the need for more services, such as restaurants, professional services and vehicle services. The former Air Force base would allow heavy industrial uses that are not allowed in the IC district.
- Public Comment: A few comments:
- The total area of the plan is too large, the plan states it is 949 square miles
 - The elevation is wrong, it is only 4000 feet.
 - The demographics and population are not accurate because many people are not registered.
- County Response: We recognize that the total area is incorrect; it should actually be approximately 430 square miles.
- Public Comment: How effective are the pink slips (questionnaire forms) going to be? I was down-zoned in the last general plan and didn't even know about it.

Public Comment: Regarding the water table, due to the location, if industrial is put along the railroad tracks it will provide the potential for impacts to our water quality.

Public Comment: It seems that the consensus is that people do not want heavy industry in the plan area.

Public Comment: Need community notification beyond the current process. Also we did not vote for anyone on the panel and therefore do not feel they represent our interests.

Public Comment: We need constructive meetings and unity.

Public Comment: As a result of this plan, code enforcement will be aggressive and many people will be in violation for things like storage trailers. I do not like the restrictions on RV parks. The 160 acre minimum land area restriction for private off-road vehicle parks is too restrictive. If I have a smaller piece of land but there is nobody around to be impacted, do not see why it could not accommodate an off-road vehicle park. The current flood control channel allows too much runoff onto the dry lake.

Public Question: Will there be an EIR prepared and when will the Community Plan be implemented?

County Response: The EIR is being prepared concurrently with the General Plan update and should be available in early 2006. The Community Plan will be implemented upon adoption by the Board of Supervisors, in summer of 2006.

Public Question: How will the infrastructure improvements be funded?

County Response: The community plan does not create any new or different funding mechanisms than are used currently.

Public Comment: There are large holes in the ground without fencing (Rancho Lucerne, State property). It is a safety and code enforcement issue.

Public Comment: This plan takes away property rights.

Public Comment: The draft that was provided by the committee has major discrepancies. It adds Manufacturing II. My suggestion is to make all property along the highway into highway commercial. We need government accountability; they need to stop working behind our backs.

County Response: The proposed IC district would not allow Manufacturing II other than firewood contractor yards.

Public Questions: Will something be provided which shows the questions and statements made during this meeting and your responses?

County Response: We will respond to questions, not sure how we will respond to statements.

Public Comment: Need to support agricultural industry.

Public Question: In what way will this impact our real-estate taxes?

County Response: Real-estate taxes will not be changed because a community plan was prepared.

Public Comment: Haven't heard anything regarding meters on wells.

County Response: The County has no intention of putting meters on wells.

Public Comment: Caltrans has no intentions of widening SR-18 until 2020. An easement (widened highway) will damage small businesses located along the highway. Widening will decrease parking areas.

If you believe these notes are materially incorrect, please note your corrections and forward to:

- *By Mail:* Carrie Hyke, Land Use Services Dept., Co. of San Bernardino, 385 North Arrowhead Ave., San Bernardino 92415-0182
- *By Fax:* (909) 387- 3223; or
- *By E-mail:* chyke@lusc.sbcounty.gov

All California state laws can be researched at the following website: www.leginfo.ca.gov